

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT
U.S. Application No. 10/759,279
Attorney Docket No. Q79062

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claim 2 has been editorially amended. Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the remarks presented herein.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and §102(e) - Norman et al.

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Norman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,719,589) (hereinafter “Norman”).

Regarding claim 1, the claimed invention relates to a driving method of a light-emitting display. In the driving method, “during a reset period after a scan period for scanning an arbitrary scan line is complete and before scanning the following scan line is started, applying a first reset voltage to all of said scan lines and applying a second reset voltage that is greater than said first reset voltage to all of said drive lines.”

The Examiner has alleged in paragraph 4 on pages 5-6 of the Office Action that Norman’s teaching of an open terminal/circuit condition for the row rest potential and selection of any non-zero voltage to be used as the column rest potential discloses the claimed invention. However, as disclosed in column 6, lines 57-59 of Norman, Norman’s row rest potential “may or may not be the same as the column rest potential, and may be an open terminal (or unconnected).” Therefore, Norman’s row rest potential may be equal to the column rest potential, or may be different than the column rest potential, or may be an open terminal or unconnected. Such an unrestricted relationship between Norman’s row rest potential and column

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT
U.S. Application No. 10/759,279
Attorney Docket No. Q79062

rest potential does not teach or suggest the particularly claimed element of “a second reset voltage that is greater than said first reset voltage,” as recited by claim 1.

The claimed invention explicitly recites that the second reset voltage is greater than the first reset voltage. However, Norman only discloses that the row rest potential may have the same or different value as the column rest potential. Such a disclosure by Norman would not suggest any particular relationship (such as a requiring the column rest potential to be greater than the row rest potential), but instead only broadly defines a large realm of possible values for the row rest potential itself, independent from its relationship with the column rest potential. Therefore, Norman does not teach or suggest “a second reset voltage that is greater than said first reset voltage,” as recited by claim 1.

Furthermore, the Examiner has also alleged in paragraph 4 on pages 6-7 of the Office Action that in a hypothetical case of a disconnection of the input signal in Norman, a reset state would be achieved. Such a situation would amount to a “hard reset,” in which Norman’s apparatus may be necessitated to restart processing anew. However, although the Examiner describes a case in which processing may be interrupted, such an interruption fails to teach or suggest “a reset period after a scan period for scanning an arbitrary scan line is complete and before scanning the following scan line is started, applying a first reset voltage to all of said scan lines and applying a second reset voltage that is greater than said first reset voltage to all of said drive lines,” as recited by claim 1.

If in fact Norman’s processing is somehow interrupted after completion of scanning Row #1 of FIG. 3 and an interruption occurs while scanning Row #2 and before scanning Row #3, this

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT
U.S. Application No. 10/759,279
Attorney Docket No. Q79062

scenario would still fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention because in the case of an interruption after completion of scanning Row #1, the following scan line (Row #2 in Norman) would never occur because after such an interruption (a hard reset), Norman's system would ultimately restart processing from the beginning, and thus Row #1 would be scanned. Therefore, no reset period as claimed would ever occur in Norman, because the reset period is recited to occur "after a scan period for scanning an arbitrary scan line is complete and before scanning the following scan line is started," as recited by claim 1. The hard reset as described by the Examiner would require that *a previous scan line* be scanned again after the disconnection, and not the following scan line, as claimed.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, Applicant's claim 1 distinguishes over Norman. Applicant's claims 2-18 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 1, which as established above, distinguish over Norman. Therefore, claims 2-18 are patentable over Norman for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and § 102(e) are respectfully requested.

With further regards to claim 2, "the difference between said second reset voltage and said first reset voltage is set to be lower than the light emission threshold voltage of said light-emitting element." The Examiner has relied on column 7, lines 3-18 of Norman for this teaching. However, Norman discloses only that the column rest potential combined with a row rest potential can be any potential below a level where individual LEDs of an array will turn ON. On the contrary, Applicant's claim 2 recites that *a difference between* the second reset voltage

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT AMENDMENT
U.S. Application No. 10/759,279
Attorney Docket No. Q79062

and the first reset voltage is set to be lower than the light emission threshold voltage of the light-emitting element. Therefore, Norman's column rest potential **combined** with row rest potential being below a level does not teach or suggest the **difference** between the second reset voltage and the first reset voltage being lower than a light emission threshold voltage, as claimed. At least by virtue of these additional differences as well as the aforementioned differences, Applicant's claimed invention distinguishes over Norman.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 12, 2006